

# **Meeting Minutes, August 3, 2005**

## **City Center Advisory Commission**

CCAC Members Present: Carolyn Barkley Gretchen Buehner, Marland Henderson, Mike Marr, Judy Munro, Carl Switzer, Mike Stevenson

CCAC Member Absent: Jim Andrews

Staff Present: Jim Hendryx, Duane Roberts, Barbara Shields

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Mike Marr at 6:35 PM. He informed the group that the meeting format for this and future meetings would be open and inclusive. Commission and audience members alike would be recognized and allowed to participate in the meeting. He then asked everyone present to introduce themselves. Self introductions by committee members, staff, consultants, and some ten to twelve audience members followed.

### **2. Approval of Minutes**

Copies of written comments on the minutes of the July 13, 2005, CCAC meeting submitted by Mr. Bill McMonagle were handed out. These include three main points. Carolyn stated that the comments do not affect the content of the minutes. Gretchen commented that the minutes accurately reflect what was said at the meeting. With regard to one of the three main points, Tina Mosca commented that the "overall statewide impact" of the revenue forgone by school districts as a result of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is slight.

Agreement was reached that the Commission will acknowledge receipt of Mr. McMonagle's comments and that they will be included as an addendum to the August 3, 2005, meeting minutes. At his suggestion, Jeff Tashman will provide written clarifications addressing each of the comments. These will be attached to the addendum. Following this, the minutes of the July 13, 2005, CCAC meeting were approved as submitted.

### **3. Draft Public Involvement Plan Outline**

Margaret Norton-Arnold introduced this topic. She distributed copies of two handouts. One was the preliminary results of the telephone survey. The other was the outline of the UR outreach plan. She briefly touched on the survey results. All the telephone survey calls have been made and the results tabulated. A formal report will be available at the August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. It will include cross tabulations and in-depth information.

The top line, first look at the survey results is very positive. The UR effort "starts out at a very positive place." The results lead her to be "cautiously optimistic" regarding the level of public support for the use of TIF. The survey included 400 "committed" voters. These are defined as voters who voted in the last two elections and are representative of those likely to come to the polls in 2006. Some 69% of those surveyed are aware of the Downtown Improvement Plan. This is a high level of awareness. Two periodicals, the Tigard Times and the Cityscape, are the respondents' key information sources. The most important citywide issues identified are traffic congestion on Highway 99W and schools. People want a sense of a core or place. The survey results indicate a "strong desire to make it [downtown revitalization] happen." Most believe that a revitalized downtown is "good for the whole community" and also that public investment in the downtown would create private economic development. Some 67% are somewhat likely or likely to vote for TIF. Margaret views this as "a high place to start" and "a good base to start with." The "uphill climb is not as steep" as it could be, because of "the low level of opposition" to the use of TIF. Other survey results are that natural area preservation is important to likely voters.

Gretchen commented on the high numbers related to the downtown planning effort. Margaret responded that the numbers reflect that those involved in the downtown effort "did a good job of communicating." Marland commented that the results are indicative of the success of the Downtown Task Force's "open process". Mike Stevenson noted that the results show that the people of Tigard are "ready for change. They see what other communities around them are doing."

In response to another question, Margaret indicated that 400 likely Tigard voters were surveyed. The sample included all age ranges, and the results can be applied to the universe of "committed voters".

Carl asked for clarification on whether the survey included any questions that targeted interest in family- versus adult-oriented activities. Margaret responded that, according to the consultant who conducted the opinion survey, the question related to green spaces can be interpreted as a family-related question. Jim pointed out another family-oriented question included the survey. This was the question about the need for a "gathering spot for families." Carl responded that whether this and the other question relate to families is open to interpretation. There is no specific question in the survey that refers to family-oriented activities.

Alice Gaut commented that, as a candidate for City Council last election, many of the community members she talked with expressed an interest in open space preservation.

Margaret next touched on the second handout, the communication plan outline. She elaborated that the plan is based on the survey results, previous Downtown

Plan public outreach efforts and the outcome of the June UR focus group or brainstorming session. The completed outreach plan will include a message and list of core target groups, plus a public involvement strategy and a timetable listing "who will do what."

She asked the commission members to review the plan outline, goal statement, and other aspects of the outline and to provide comments.

Mike Marr commented that the timeline shown puts the City in a position of actively endorsing the ballot measure. The phrase "achieve public support" goes too far toward advocacy. Mike cautioned that statements in the outreach plan should not make the City into an "active proponent or opponent." This should be an "information as opposed to a support program." Margaret replied that she would like to see people put their "fingerprints on the plan." Should CCAC members see any other places where she has "gone over the edge," she would appreciate this brought to her attention.

Jim pointed out that the City has greater latitude in its public statements before TIF is placed on the ballot than after. He promised to provide the Commission a legal "description" from the City Attorney on the question of what constitutes advocacy.

Margaret commented that facts and accurate information are what should be repeated in the form of key messages. "No one loses with TIF. Everyone wins" is one example. Regarding the target audience, Margaret commented that Summerfield is a large voter block. Downtown business owners are another discrete committed voter group.

Gretchen pointed out that a large number of business owners are based outside the downtown area and that this complicates effective outreach efforts. Mike commented that the term "business owners" includes property owners. Different interests that would "play into this concept, such as landlords and business operators, may have different ideas." Gretchen asked the CCAC's members who are downtown owners to prepare a memo dealing with the "agendas of business and property owners," explaining that this would help her to understand the differences among the various downtown groups. Mike Marr indicated that he doubted that anyone would have the knowledge needed to prepare such a memo. Mike Stevenson noted that one problem with having very diverse groups of owners is that big owners may not be involved with the local business operation. Gretchen responded that any information that could be provided would help her to better understand the different perspectives of the business owners located in the downtown area.

Mike commented that data and statistics on the businesses, such as business types and number of employees, was compiled by staff some time ago and that this information may be helpful in painting the big picture. He asked staff to

provide a copy of this information to Gretchen. Carolyn commented that the Commission could "use input from small group meetings" to identify key leaders among the downtown owners.

An audience member asked if the "Chamber could be a resource to get the views of business owners." Gretchen pointed that the outreach plan included open houses meetings. Her impression is that people want "organized presentations" rather than open house-type meeting formats.

Margaret concluded by giving the committee a "homework assignment." She asked members to go through the draft concept plan and to jot down their ideas "as something strikes you."

Carolyn asked when a public information packet would be ready. "People are asking questions" about the plan. They want some information now. She asked Margaret to work with Jeff to put together an information piece on how UR is structured. Margaret responded that she would see what could be done.

Jeff commented that based on the survey results, "people appear to know a lot about the UR plan." The public typically will have "a lot of questions about the UR process." A list of frequently asked questions with answers might be a useful outreach tool. Margaret added that these questions could be generic to start with, followed by updates in 4-6 weeks.

#### **4. Refine UR Area Boundaries**

Jeff introduced this topic. A major component in an UR plan is the objectives to be accomplished. He asked if there were any reason to change the boundaries used in the Downtown Plan. A major reason not to change is that "people know about this area, but they don't know about an area within a modified boundary". The main reason not to change the boundary is that "you lose your head start."

The study area for the Commuter Rail UR study included the industrial area located east of downtown. The rationale for adding this area is that it contains one or two large undeveloped areas. This provides room for redevelopment and for the nearby relocation of existing industrial uses within the Downtown area.

The large scale retail identified in the downtown plan is surrounded by existing industrial uses. "The process of redeveloping downtown has to involve the transition of the area to CBD office/retail/housing." The industrial area adjacent to the downtown provides a location or receiving area for businesses that might choose to relocate. He qualified this comment by saying that we haven't talked to anyone affected by the UR plan as yet.

Gretchen commented the rail "finger-shaped area" is included in the

downtown plan, but not depicted on the consultant's boundary map. The area in question is the rail corridor between Commercial and Tigard Streets. Considerable discussion of the rail crossings at Tiedeman and North Dakota followed. These provide a potential opportunity for the City to give up or trade an existing crossing in order obtain ODOT approval for a new crossing at Ash Street.

Jim commented that the "gateway" concept is a key feature of the downtown plan. He pointed out that the Safeway shopping plaza is important to the Main Street gateway plan.

Mike Stevenson commented that "we identified what we said is the downtown" during the downtown plan outreach process. If a downtown UR is successful, in two years we could consider adding other areas. Adding a new area would affect different groups of owners. Including new areas at this stage "changes everything." Waiting a few years will give the CCAC a better idea of the need for and suitability of adding other areas.

Jeff commented that the industrial area he pointed out earlier as a possible addition doesn't need to be included in the UR district in order to serve as a relocation area.

Carolyn commented that changing the boundary later would require another election, "which means the electorate may say no." Mike Stevenson commented that it may take 4-5 years to create a second district. Jeff clarified that changing the size of the district by more than 20% requires voter approval. The vote would be on the new addition only. He also noted that "you have to repeat the [adoption] process, but not repeat the plan."

Jeff commented that the consultants will change their boundary map to include the rail corridor piece extending northward. "My sense is that the Commission's feeling is to take in a second rail crossing." Carolyn commented that "no money could be spent there" if it is not included in the plan.

Carl commented that it is his "personal feeling that everything should be done upfront" in order to avoid the need to go back through the UR process. He supports adding the former Safeway plaza or a crossing or overpass over Hall or Greenburg now rather than later if "these are needed in order to provide a gateway entry point."

Carolyn commented that general public is unaware of any site specific boundaries. "They won't notice if the Downtown Plan boundary should change." An audience member asked to what extent the boundary is defined by private investment. As "I look at real estate opportunities, Safeway is the best site." In his view, the decision to extend the downtown plan boundary "depends on private dollars." He also noted that In future, downtown retail could be competing

with Safeway. Jeff responded that financing within the UR area depends on private investment. "That is the engine that drives the plan."

Alice Ellis Gaut commented that "people expect UR not to end at HWY 99 West. They expect improvements in their neighborhoods." It would be a "disaster" if portions the neighborhoods around St. Anthony's, Commercial, and Greenburg are left out of the plan.

Lily Lilly commented that she lives on Knoll Street east of Hall. She hopes the plan includes all corners of Hall and HWY 99 West. "Look at the car dealer." That property is "unsightly and an eyesore."

Alexander Craghead commented on the "financial impact of adding more properties". He noted that there should be no obligation to "spread expenditures evenly" throughout the area as a whole.

Mike Marr proposed to "not shoot ourselves in the foot", as it were, by taking to the voters an UR area that is significantly different from the properties included in the Downtown Improvement Plan. Showing success with one area will generate voter support for creating a second district from surrounding properties. "The concern is that by doubling the size of the area, are we putting the initial 2006 vote at risk," since the new area has not been the one "we have been sharing with people" The new areas discussed may be deserving, but "we don't want the voters to be skittish by biting off more than we can chew."

Mike Stevenson commented that a lot of areas in Tigard are blighted. But unless the CCAC decides to "change from a downtown plan to a city-wide plan," other properties shouldn't be added to the previously delineated downtown area. The Ash Street bridge created major opposition. "We don't know that people in new areas are in favor of their inclusion."

Carolyn mentioned that the CCAC is "not beholden to a specific area." Seven in ten residents don't know where the boundary is located.

Mike Marr called for a vote on expanding the boundary selectively. All but three Commission members voted in favor of the motion. He asked, "if the boundary is expanded, which areas should be added?" He stated that a vote to add Safeway plus Center Street, which is zoned for commercial use, will have the effect of "gaining or losing voter support."

Jeff commented that there is no need for a final decision at this time. Work on revenue and project elements can be done first before a final decision is made on the district boundary.

Judy commented that the CCAC's role is to make recommendations to Council, not to make final decisions. The reason for keeping the present boundary is that

“so much history is involved.” Although she can see the other point of view, she lacks the energy to pitch it again.”

Carolyn commented that the boundary is not cut in stone. All “during the three years information on the plan was presented to the public, we always stressed that this is a concept.” She believes the public would support a boundary change.

Mike Marr indicated that he would support a “selective, well defined expansion based on a common sense approach, not simply in order to capture more revenue.” If the expansion creates a better traffic flow into downtown, he can “roll with it.”

Mike Stevenson commented that many areas would qualify as gateways. “Creating gateways is a great idea. But will it make it any easier to sell the UR plan?” The Ash neighborhood is an example of opposition. “Adding new areas that we don’t know anything about, may create other potential pockets of opposition.”

Gretchen commented that Center Street is a cut-through route. Any renewal would help the situation. “People there would be supportive of UR.” Carolyn commented that “benefit to the whole City is important, not what 15 people think.” An audience member commented that Center includes existing businesses that would benefit from UR.

Marland proposed “a good, better, best scenario.” What are the pros and cons of adding each new area? He can see the advantages of some additions. Jeff responded that he would be willing to draft a memo showing the pros and cons associated with specific “pocket additions. This topic deserves more deliberation. Hall and HWY99 is Tigard’s sense of place.” The Commission concurred with the need for a memo.

Mike Marr commented that “we will maintain and build on public trust by expanding the boundary for common sense traffic improvement reasons.”

## **5. Draft Urban Renewal Goals and Objectives**

Jeff introduced this discussion. There appears to be a consensus on the main goals. The Downtown “vision statement is good, but makes a long sentence.”

Last week he handed out a sheet with a list of five proposed UR goals. Four of these were taken from the Downtown Improvement Plan. He added a fifth goal that talks more explicitly about private development. “The downtown plan talks about public spaces and businesses.” He stated that another goal should be to promote high quality development. “Money comes from high quality.” To “make a good downtown”, you also have to think of quality development. This includes

well designed office and residential buildings and ways of making development relate to an urban village. The new goal is intended to endorse development that relates to the development proposed in the downtown plan.

Mike Marr commented that incoming development should look upscale in terms of regional standards, but the low end of upscale, because other areas in the region are years ahead of downtown Tigard. Jeff commented that quality is a better word than upscale.

An audience member asked whether Council would have “design authority” in the UR area. Jeff responded that Council would not have the authority to control the quality of development. But part of the downtown plan implementation could be the adoption of design standards. Another approach is to provide incentives to targeted investment. This requires “a process for figuring out what to do and when.” This approach is similar to private sector development negotiations. UR allows localities to negotiate the design of private projects. “This is the carrot and stick approach and is done all the time.” UR authorities negotiate higher quality in return for public investment.

An audience member asked if UR would give the City the power to assemble property. Jeff responded that state law gives local jurisdictions the authority to condemn property inside the UR district, but only if the property is listed in an UR plan. UR plans can exclude condemnation for site assemble, also.

There is a lot of public concern about this authority. The state legislature is considering legislation that would prohibit land assembly on behalf of private development. Public opinion appears to be running against the use of condemnation for site assembly. Half the UR plans Jeff has worked on have not allowed condemnation. He added that properties targeted for condemnation have to be specifically identified in the UR plan or a minor amendment is needed. Future state law may not allow the use of condemnation.

## **6. Draft Urban Renewal Projects**

The plan gives a lot of guidance on what the community wants to see in the downtown. Jeff will come back to the CCAC next meeting with a list of projects and activities that are designed to promote quality development.

Jim questioned whether the relocation of businesses is a “goal of the vision” that is understood by the public. There should be a goal statement about the relocation of businesses that includes “finding them a happy place to go.” Mike Marr agreed that this is an appropriate goal statement, but questioned how far the plan should “go with numbers” or in defining “fair compensation.”



Jeff commented that Light Industrial is a transitional zone. The underlying market is creating value for the landowner. The issue is not relocation itself, but whether to “force people to relocate.”

Mike Marr commented on the need for an “upfront appraisal of property” to provide a guarantee and adjustment for a “normal property value appreciation factor.” Jeff responded that it takes some analysis to measure value. Building value can depreciate over time, as well as appreciate. Mike noted that “providing guarantees would show some property owners that there are built-in guarantees” and that the UR “plan is not done at the expense of owners.”

Jeff indicated that he would like to “pick a few properties for a sample evaluation.” He commented that the value of buildings is already affected by zoning.” He will take the value of property today (tax statement) and try to do an analysis of what the benefit on those properties would be from the UR agency financing public improvements instead of developers. He pointed out that as an alternative to condemnation, the City could waive fees or provide set asides in order to encourage development or provide some other “benefits for developers to assemble properties.” It is a decision of the CCAC and Council as to whether condemnation is included in the plan.

Gretchen expressed concern that “the downtown is reaching a tipping point” and could go downhill. Property values could decline if an UR plan is not implemented. She supports limited condemnation authority covering properties that are a nuisance.

Jeff commented that condemnation could be included in the UR plan as an objective or as a subset of a goal.

## **7. Other Business/Announcements/Next Agenda**

Jim updated the CCAC on the appointment of at-large members. A Council appointments committee is interviewing six or seven candidates for four open positions. Formal appointments will be made at Council’s August 23rd meeting.

Mike Marr adjourned the meeting at 8:40 PM.